

The undersigned is an Amateur Radio operator, holding an Amateur Extra Class Radio license issued by the FCC, licensed to use the call sign K3ZO. I have been an Amateur Radio operator for more than 50 years, and I also hold a current Amateur Radio license in Thailand. I have also held Amateur Radio licenses in the Dominican Republic, Colombia and Argentina. Thus I have been able to observe and participate in Amateur Radio operations in a wide variety of circumstances and field conditions.

In reading through the comments which have been presented in connection with this proceeding, I have been struck by the cavalier way in which some industry commenters have referred to the Amateur Radio Service. It is as though there would be no consequences whatsoever for the Public Interest, Convenience or Necessity were the Amateur Radio Service to be rendered inoperable due to high interference levels from new technologies.

During my 25-year career as a U. S. Foreign Service Officer I was involved in a number of situations where my ability to utilize my Amateur Radio skills proved absolutely vital to ongoing U. S. Government missions, including provision of communications between the U. S. Ambassador and the U. S. Navy during the Dominican revolution of 1965; on-site provision of communications to bring relief supplies to populations devastated by a hurricane in the Dominican Republic; communications between Organization of the American States staffers in Washington and their families in Mexico during the Mexico City earthquake; and communications between stranded constituents in the Caribbean and the office of Senator Nunn during a power outage in a Caribbean nation caused by a hurricane, to name only a few.

Shortwave radio remains the only absolutely reliable means for communicating over long distances because all of the requirements for transmission are under the complete control of the Amateur Radio operator. He can configure his system so that no recourse whatsoever to systems outside of his control is necessary, and can transmit his signal no matter what the condition of public utilities happens to be at any given moment. Would the Commission be serving the public well were it to take steps which would lead to the diminution or even cessation of this capability on the part of ordinary members of the general public?

In its comments, the United Power Line Council reports: "...The UPLC is pleased to respond that there has been no interference reported in any of the field trials by its members..." Before I would give any value to this statement, were I a member of the Commission, I would ask to see the following documents:

1. Letter from the utility engaging in the trial to a local Amateur Radio organization, advising of the existence and location of the trial and inviting that organization's participation as an observer.
2. Names and call signs of the Amateur Radio operators participating in the trial, and the distances of their stations from the nearest location involved in the trial.
3. Their observations of the results, signed by the Amateur Radio

operators themselves.

In the absence of such documentation, the UPLC comment is meaningless.

In reading through the history of this proceeding, I am struck by a certain lack of transparency on the part of some industry participants. The fact that the ARRL has had to resort to an FOIA in order to ascertain the details of certain trials speaks for itself. Were such trials completely above-board, the results should already be a matter of public record. What explanation does the Commission have for the fact that these results are not already accessible to the general public?

Respectfully Submitted,

Alfred A. Laun, III, K3ZO